

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 55-69 are pending in the application, Claims 1-54 having been cancelled, and Claims 55-69 having been added by the present amendment. Support for the new claims is found, for example, in the specification at pages 80-115.

In the outstanding Office Action, the abstract was objected to, Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 17-23, 30, 31, 33, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and Claims 16, 26, 36, 46, 49, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yehuda (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,683).

With respect to the objection to the Abstract, a new Abstract is provided. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that objection to the Abstract is overcome.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 17-23, 30, 31, 33, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants respectfully submit that this ground of rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the above-noted claims.

By way of explanation, the meaning of some terms will be explained. "Document," as used in the specification, is different from an application file such as a common doc file (i.e., a file with an extension .doc). Rather, "document" refers to a data type in which a plurality of application files are bound together. For example, a document is made of a 5 page doc file, a one page xls file, and a 6 page ppt file.

"Section," as used in the specification, means each of the files forming the "document." In the above example, section 1 corresponds to the 5 page doc file, section 2 corresponds to the one page xls file, and section 3 corresponds to the 6 page ppt file. In this example, each file corresponds to an application file. However, the claimed invention is not

limited to only this example. Images such as JPEG or TIFF may also be regarded as sections within the document.

Each "section" has its own file name. When "merging" or "coupling" these "sections" together, one "document" is produced. A contrary operation of obtaining "section" from a document is referred to as "decomposing." Furthermore, the operation of "coupling" or "decomposing" may be used among "documents" themselves (i.e., two "documents" may be coupled together to form a new "document").

For each "section," a file name is given to it when it is created. Then, when a "document" is created from a plurality of "sections," a "document" name needs to be given. When "coupling" is carried out, the document name can be managed. However, when "decomposing" is carried out, it is difficult to manage a relationship between the respective sections obtained when the document is decomposed.

Further, when "documents" themselves are coupled together, problems regarding how to manage names of respective "documents"/respective "sections" may arise. For example, problems may arise for a case where the respective "documents"/respective "sections" before the coupling have a relationship with a "document" name of the thus-created "document" from the coupling.

It is an object of the claimed invention to solve the above-noted problems that may occur when coupling is carried out.

With respect to the rejections based on art, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 55 patentably distinguishes over Yehuda. New Claim 55 recites, *inter alia*,

a document name generating part configured to cause a document name of second document data obtained from coupling the plurality of document data to take over a document name of the document data from which the coupling is thus carried out, and also, configured to use a document name of the second document data as file names of the respective document data from which the second documents data is thus obtained.

Yehuda does not describe or suggest at least these elements of new Claim 55.

Yehuda discloses a computerized document management system for managing a document acted upon by at least one participant in creating, evaluating, or revising the document.¹ However, Yehuda is silent for processing in which, assuming that a document C is obtained from coupling documents A and B, a document name of document C takes over a document name of the document A (or B), and also, original documents A and B, which should become respective section of the document C, should have names A-1, A-2, ..., A-n.

Rather, Yehuda only describes parsing a document.² The outstanding Office Action appears to take the position that item 320 of Fig. 9B and col. 12, lines 35-58 disclose the coupling of documents 0.3 and 1.0.³ Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 8A, which shows item 320, was intended.

Yehuda discloses that a segment file name field 320, shown in Fig. 8A, is provided to identify the name of a file containing the document or segment to which a comment is directed.⁴ There is no disclosure or suggestion that documents 0.3 and 1.0 of Fig. 8A are coupled together.

Furthermore, Yehuda does not describe or suggest the claimed “a document name generating part configured to cause a document name of second document data obtained from coupling the plurality of document data to take over a document name of the document data from which the coupling is thus carried out, and also, configured to use a document name of the second document data as file names of the respective document data from which the second documents data is thus obtained.”

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 55 (and Claims 56-59 dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Yehuda.

¹ Yehuda, col. 2, lines 45-48.

² See Yehuda, col. 5, lines 40-43, col. 8, lines 65-67, col. 9, lines 28-29, and col. 10, lines 35-40.

³ Office Action, page 6.

⁴ Yehuda, col. 12, lines 35-39.

Application No. 10/601,645
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2005

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 60 and 65 are similar to Claim 55. Thus,
Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 60 and 65 (and Claims 62-64 and 66-69), for at
least the reasons stated for Claim 55.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous
discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for
allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Reg # 29,099

GJM/SNS/JW/kkn
I:\ATTY\JW\238486US\238486.AM DUE MARCH 29..DOC